

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

• _	

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,581	02/02/2006	Masahiro Sakurada	126274	6619
25944 7590 11/26/2007 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850			. EXAM	INER
			HITESHEW, FE	HITESHEW, FELISA CARLA
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850		A, VA 22320-4850	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		•	1792	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/26/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

•		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		Application No.					
		10/560,581	SAKURADA ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Felisa C. Hiteshew	1722				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANS ansions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Poperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
2a) <u></u>	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>the amendment filed on October 23, 2007</u> . This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□ Applicati 9)□ 10)□	Claim(s) 1-3 and 8-24 is/are pending in the app 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) 1-3 and 8-20 is/are allowed. Claim(s) 21-24 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction	vn from consideration. relection requirement. repted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is objected to by the drawing(s) is objected to by the Edrawing(s) is objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau see the attached detailed Office action for a list of	have been received. have been received in Application by documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
2) Notic 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te				

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see the remarks section from the amendment, filed October 23, 2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-20 under 35 U.S. C. §103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made for claims 21-24.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. Claims 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Sakurada, et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,190,452 B1).

Sakurada, et al '452 B1 teaches a similar method that results in the same product as claims 21-24 of the instant invention.

As stated in MPEP 2113 [R-1] "[E]ven though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process." In re Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695, 698, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (citations omitted). Once a product appearing to be substantially identical is found and a 35 U.S.C. 102/103 rejection is made, the burden shifts to the applicant to show an unobvious difference "The Patent Office bears a lesser burden of proof in making out a case of prima facie obviousness for product-by-process claims

because of their peculiar nature" than when a product is claimed in the conventional fashion. In re Fessmann, 489 F.2d 742, 744, 180 USPQ 324, 326 (CCPA 1974). Once the examiner provides a rationale tending to show that the claimed product appears to be the same or similar to that of the prior art, although produced by a different process, the burden shifts to applicant to come forward with evidence establishing an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art product. In re Marosi, 710 F.2d 798, 802, 218 USPQ 289, 292 (Fed. Cir.1983). Accordingly since the resulting product appears to be the same the instant claims are anticipated by and/or rendered obvious by the references.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 2. Claims 1-3 and 8-20 are allowed.
- 3. As allowable subject matter has been indicated, applicant's reply must either comply with all formal requirements or specifically traverse each requirement not complied with. See 37 CFR 1.111(b) and MPEP § 707.07(a).
- 4. This application is in condition for allowance except for the following formal matters: The cancellation of productu-by-process claims 21-24.

Prosecution on the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 25 USPQ 74, 453 O.G. 213, (Comm'r Pat. 1935).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this action is set to expire **TWO MONTHS** from the mailing date of this letter.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

10/560,581 Art Unit: 1792

examiner should be directed to Felisa Hiteshew whose telephone number is (571) 272-1463. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Thursday from 5:30 AM to 4:00 PM with Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr can be reached on (571) 272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-1463.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system. see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866- 217-9197 (toll-free).

/ Felisa Hiteshew Primary Examiner